

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-16 and 21-24 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-15 and 20-24 stand rejected. Claims 16-19 are withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 have been amended as set forth herein. Claims 17-20 have been cancelled herein. All amendments and cancellations are made without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendments. Specifically, the amendments to claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are supported by the specification at, for instance, page 49 and the original claims. The amendment of claim 16 is additionally supported by claim 20. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 1-15 and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. (*See*, Office Action of December 19, 2006, at page 2). Claim 20 has been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer, thus obviating the rejection as to this claim. Applicants traverse the rejection as to the remaining claims as set forth herein.

The Examiner states that the “A’s, along with their subscripts and m and n are too small and unclear” in the structures of claims 1, 6, 11 and 20. (*Id.*). Although Applicants do not agree that claims 1, 6, 11 and 20 are indefinite, to expedite prosecution, these claims have been amended to clarify the structures recited. The amendments are supported at least at page 49 of the as-filed specification.

Furthermore, the Examiner states that claim 16 would be allowed if rewritten to recite the limitations of claim 20 after the word “comprises” instead of the presently recited language after that word. (*Id.*) According to the Examiner’s suggestion, claim 16 has been amended to remove the language after the word “comprises” and to replace this language with the language recited in claim 20.

Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection of claims 1-15 and 20-24 are respectfully requested. Applicants believe claim 16 is also now in condition for allowance.

#### **ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS**

The amendments to the claims should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and do not add any new matter to the application. Additionally, the amendments should be entered since they comply with requirements as to form and place the application in condition for allowance. Further, the amendments do not raise new issues or require a further search since the amendments incorporate elements from dependent claims into independent claims and/or are supported by the as-filed specification. Finally, if the Examiner determines that the amendments do not place the application in condition for allowance, entry is respectfully requested since they certainly remove issues for appeal.

Application No. 10/605,961  
Amendment dated February 12, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of December 19, 2006

Docket No.:2921-0150PUS1


**CONCLUSION**

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, please contact Thomas J. Siepmann, Ph.D., Registration No 57,374, at the offices of Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,384

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants

